UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,963	10/24/2001	Robert Anthony Hirst	18377-0006	2781

7590 06/29/2004

William L. Warren
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
999 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309-3996

EXAMINER	
GUCKER, STEPHEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,963	HIRST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Gucker	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-7, drawn to methods for producing differentiated or partially differentiated neurons, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

II. Claims 8-16, drawn to methods for producing dopaminergic neurons, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

III. Claims 17-20, drawn to a partially or terminally differentiated neuronal cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

IV. Claims 21-27, drawn to methods for the production of genetically modified neuronal cells, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

V. Claim 28 (in part), drawn to methods involving genetically modified or unmodified neuronal cells, or their differentiated or partially differentiated progeny, for the production of transgenic animals, classified in class 800, subclass 8.

VI. Claims 28 (in part) and 29, drawn to methods involving genetically modified or unmodified neuronal cells, or their differentiated or partially differentiated progeny, for human cell therapy, or human or animal gene therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 1.

VII. Claims 30-31, drawn to methods for the treatment of neurodegenerative and CNS disorders in mammals utilizing the neuronal cells produced according to any one

of claims 1-16 and 21-27 in cell replacement therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The various methods of Inventions I-II and IV-VII are drawn to patentably distinct methods. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for Inventions that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: The methods of Inventions I-II and IV-VII are separate and distinct, each one from the other, as they utilize different starting materials, method steps, and require different outcomes and non-coextensive searches.

Therefore, a search and examination of all the methods of Inventions I-II and IV-VII in one patent application would result in an undue burden, sense the searches for the Inventions' methods are not co-extensive.

Inventions I-II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the partially or terminally differentiated neuronal cells of Invention III can be made by a method for producing differentiated or partially differentiated neurons of Invention I or they can be made by a method for producing dopaminergic neurons of Invention II.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where

applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Because these Inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, separate search requirements, and/or different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

\Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Stephen Gucker, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-0883**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Gary Kunz, Ph.D.** can be reached on **(571) 272-0887**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

June 28, 2004

Eileen B. O'Hara